



King's Research Portal

DOI:

[10.1093/ageing/afy110](https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afy110)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Hewitt, J., Long, S., Carter, B., Bach, S., McCarthy, K., & Clegg, S. (2018). The prevalence of frailty and its association with clinical outcomes in general surgery: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Age and Ageing*, 47(6), 793-800. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afy110>

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

The Prevalence of Frailty and its association with clinical outcomes in General Surgery: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis.

ABSTRACT

OBJECTIVES: To investigate the prevalence and impact of frailty for general surgical patients.

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS: We conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis. Studies published between January 1st, 1980 and August 31st 2017 were searched from 7 databases. Incidence of clinical outcomes (mortality at day 30 and day 90; readmission at day 30, surgical complications and length of stay) were estimated by frailty subgroup (not-frail, pre-frail, and frail).

RESULTS: 2281 participants from 9 observational studies were included, 49.3% (1013/2055) were male. Mean age ranged from 61 to 77 years old. Eight studies provided outcome data and were quality assessed and of fair or good quality, and one study only provided an estimate of prevalence and was not quality assessed. The prevalence estimate ranged between 31.3% to 45.8% for pre-frailty and 10.4% to 37.0% for frailty. After pooling, day 30 mortality was 8% (95% CI 4% to 12%; $I^2=0\%$) for frail compared to 1% for non-frail patients (95% CI 0 to 2%; $I^2=75\%$). Due to heterogeneity the day 90 mortality was not pooled. Re-admission rates were lower in the non-frail groups but were not pooled. Complications for the frail patients were 24%, (95% CI 20 to 31%; $I^2=92\%$), pre-frail subgroup 9% (95% CI 5 to 14%; $I^2=82\%$) and non-frail 5% (95% CI 3 to 7%; $I^2=70\%$). The mean length of stay in frail people was 9.6 days (95% CI 6.2 to 12.9) and 6.4 days (4.9 to 7.9) non-frail.

CONCLUSIONS: Frailty is associated with adverse post-operative outcomes in general surgery.

Background

Frailty is a condition characterised by loss of biological reserves, failure of homeostatic mechanisms and vulnerability to adverse outcomes following stressor events such as

surgery. Delivery of surgical care becomes more challenging in this context (1). Faced with an ageing population whose rate of general surgical intervention is increasing rapidly, awareness of frailty is becoming more widespread in surgical and critical care settings (2). Similarly, the importance of the identification and management of the frail patient is increasingly being recognized. For example, the *National Confidential Enquiry into Patient Outcome and Death, An Age Old Problem*, highlighted substandard care for older surgical patients and recommended daily geriatrician clinical input for these patients (3).

In medical settings it has been shown that frailty is present in 20-50% of the middle and older aged population, depending on the exact disease and the method of frailty measurement used(4). This review further demonstrated that mortality was higher across all specialties when frailty was present but that wide variation existed(4) . For example, one large study showed that frail people aged over 75 years admitted to hospital had an odds ratio of 1.6 for death regardless of diagnosis. (5). This is much higher than a Swedish community study which demonstrated an increased hazard ratio for all cause mortality of 1.07 for older frail people(6).

Although a modest but increasing number of studies have recently assessed a number of different frailty tools in both emergency and elective general surgery against a range of outcomes, no systematic reviews have yet attempted to give an overview of the impact of frailty for people undergoing general surgery. Hence, the aim of this review was to assess frailty prevalence and its association with clinical outcomes (death, readmission to hospital, complications and length of hospital stay) within general surgery.

Methods

This systematic review was reported within the PRISMA framework. The review was registered and the protocol is available on Research Registry (reviewregistry129, <http://www.researchregistry.com>)

Search strategy

The search strategy was developed by an expert research support librarian at the University of Leeds, in full collaboration with the review team. We searched seven

electronic databases (Medline, CINAHL, The Cochrane Library, AMED, PSYCINFO, EMBASE and Web of Science) for manuscripts published from January 1st, 1980, to August 31st, 2017. All identified and relevant studies' references were manually reviewed to identify any potential studies that met the inclusion criteria. The included studies underwent a forward citation [search](#) to identify any future studies which may have referenced them. The search terms were based on MeSH terms (Medical Subject Headings) and other controlled vocabulary. Search terms relating to surgery, frailty and risk factors were used. The search strategy is outlined in supplementary file 1.

Eligibility criteria and study identification

The review process is summarised in a PRISMA flow diagram (Figure 1).

Randomized controlled trials, cohort studies and case-control study designs were eligible for inclusion. Only studies using a validated method of frailty identification were included (7). Studies that used large scale database analysis assessing frailty and surgery were excluded (8). Studies based solely in intensive care were excluded since these populations are atypical and could introduce additional confounders. No language restrictions were applied

Two reviewers (JH, SL) searched the literature and assessed the studies for eligibility independently. Disagreements were resolved through discussion with a third reviewer (BC).

Data extraction and quality assessment

Demographic information, frailty tool, frailty prevalence and outcomes data were extracted from the included studies independently by two reviewers (JH, SL) disagreements were resolved through discussion with a third reviewer (BC).

Study authors were contacted to clarify or provide additional data where it was missing or unclear.

For the studies included the quality assessment was conducted by two reviewers independently (JH, SL) and arbitrated by a third (BC) using the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) (9, 10), which assesses the risk of bias of observational studies. Each domain examined was determined as good, fair or poor. Studies were deemed to be of good quality where they scored good for all domains, fair if they scored fair in one or more domain and likewise poor if they scored poor in any one domain.

Data analysis

Frailty prevalence was estimated using studies that had categorized frailty using standard specific cut-offs for validated frailty tools (11-15). For consistency, prevalence was not calculated using studies where participants were defined as being frail using a non-standard cut-off.

Data were extracted for the following primary outcomes: short term mortality (30 day), and medium term (90 to 180 days months) mortality. Further data were extracted for the following secondary outcomes: 30 day readmission to hospital, complications and length of hospital stay. All outcomes captured dichotomous data except for the length of stay, and the treatment effects were measured by the proportion of patients experiencing the outcome. Continuous data for the length of stay were skewed, so were transformed and summary statistics were calculated on the transformed scale. Frailty subgroups were used to explore the association between frailty and outcomes. If study design and population did not exhibit clinical heterogeneity, data were pooled in a random effects meta-analysis. All meta-analyses were conducted using Stata version 13.0.

Assessment of subgroups and statistical heterogeneity

Heterogeneity was assessed using the I^2 statistic, and pooling that exhibited an I^2 over 85% was explored using subgroup analyses. All meta-analyses were presented as an estimated proportion, associated 95% confidence interval (95% CI), P-values and I^2 summary data. Frailty was a pre-specified subgroup to explore the association between frailty and outcomes. Patients were categorized as non-frail, pre-frail or frail. The following pre-specified subgroups were used to explain heterogeneity: quality assessment (high quality, versus unclear and low quality studies); age of patients (65 to 70; 70 to 80; 80+); type of surgery (elective; emergency; or combined).


Results

Identified studies and quality assessment

After removal of duplicates, 7588 records were identified, and led to 33 full texts being reviewed, where 24 were excluded. Nine were included in this analysis and are shown in the PRISMA flowchart (Figure 1) (16-24). One study only considered frailty

prevalence (16), and was excluded and not assessed for quality. This study was not considered in the meta-analysis or the quality assessment (Supplementary Table 1). Five studies were determined as good quality (17, 18, 20, 23, 24) three were categorized as fair quality (19, 21, 25) and none were categorized as poor quality. The average NOS score was 8.3. For further details of the results of the quality assessment tool, see Supplementary Tables 1A and 1B.

Figure 1: PRISMA Flowchart of included studies



Characteristics of the included studies

From the 9 studies 2281 patients were included, 49.3% were male (1013/2055) and six studies only recruited older patients (over 65 year olds). The mean age ranged from 61 to 77 years old (Table 1).

Frailty Prevalence

The 9 included studies used a range of frailty assessment tools, of which seven were deemed suitable for inclusion in the prevalence estimation. One study (23) oversampled complex cases, as such it was not a representative sample to be included in the prevalence data. The other excluded study used a range of frailty scales and was not suitable for inclusion (19). Of the included studies, two used the phenotype model (16, 20), two the Groningen Frailty Indicator (21, 24), two the deficit based model (17, 18) and one a seven point assessment of frailty traits (25). The prevalence of pre-frail ranged between 31.3%-45.8%, frailty prevalence ranged between 10.4%-37.0%. The included studies and the prevalence estimated are shown in Supplementary Table 2.

Author	Year	Country	Population Details	No. patients	Age ^{***}	Sex (%) (M:F)	Frailty index Measure	Quality assessments
Chen C	2015	Taiwan	Elective abdominal surgery (Upper Abdominal=147, lower abdominal 232), expected LOS >6 days and able to communicate	379	>65yr 74.5 ± 5.9 <u>SD</u>	216 (57.0) 163 (43.0)	5 Point Phenotype Model	NA
Hewitt J	2014	UK	Emergency general surgery admissions (upper and lower abdominal surgery), older patients. Not all patients underwent surgery	325	>65yr 77.3 (65-101)	140 (43.1) 185 (56.9)	CHSA 7 point scale (deficit derived)	Good
Joseph B	2014	USA	Emergency General Surgery (all underwent surgery), older patients	220	>65yr 75.5 ± 7.7 <u>cSD</u>	123 (55.9) 97 (44.1)	DAI 50 variables, >0.25 = frail	Good
Kenig J	2015 (2)	Poland	Emergency abdominal surgery, tertiary referral centre, operated within 24 hours	184	>65yr 76.9 ± 5.8 (65-100)	86 (46.7) 98 (53.3)	VES-13 (>=3), TRST (>=1), G8 (<=14), GFI (>=4), Rockwood (>=2), Balducci (1)	Fair
Makary M	2010	USA	Elective surgery recruited from a pre-assessment centre, older patients	594	>65yr, 71.3 (65-94)	236 (39.7) 358 (60.3)	5 Point Phenotype Model	Good
Reisinger K	2015	Netherlands	Emergency and elective colorectal cancer surgery, non-academic centre	154*	>70yr	Not stated	Groningen Frailty Indicator (>=5)	Fair
Robinson T	2013	US	Elective Colorectal Surgery, all surgery performed after at least 72 hours after presentation to hospital.	201	>65yr 74 ± 6 <u>SD</u>	Not stated	7 Domain based scoring system	Fair
Saxton A	2011	US	Elective General Surgery, Older Patients	226	No age cut off. 61 ± 13 <u>SD</u>	106 (46.9) 120 (53.1)	CHSA 70 point deficit model, >0.12 taken as frail	Good
Tegels J	2014	Netherlands	Elective Gastric Adenocarcinoma Cancer surgery, in a community teaching hospital.	127**	No age cut off. 69.8 (73-88)	106 (58.9) 74 (41.1)	Groningen Frailty Indicator (>=3)	Good

Table 1, Included Studies, all are observational (*only patients aged over 70 were assessed for frailty, ** patients with complete frailty data, *** Range unless stated as Standard Deviation (SD))

Short term mortality (Day 30), and medium term mortality (Day 90 to Day 180).

Three studies reported mortality at Day 30 (17, 18, 21), this included 9% (17/192) patients who were determined as frail, and 3% (12/479) who were non-frail. After pooling, the proportion who were frail was 8% (95% CI 4% to 12%; $I^2=0\%$), which compared to 1% of non-frail patients (95% CI 0 to 2%; $I^2=75\%$, Figure 2).

Two studies reported mortality in the medium term (17, 24), 23% (24/105) died who were frail, compared to 11% (34/300) who were not frail (Figure 3). Pooling was not possible due to severe heterogeneity, and caution is needed in the interpretation of the two subgroups (Figure 3).

Readmission at Day 30

Two studies reported the proportion of patients with a re-admission(17, 25) One study found the proportion who were re-admitted was 14% in both the frail and the non-frail groups(17) and the second 29% in the frail group, compared to 7% in the non-frail group(25).

Surgical Complications

Four studies reported the proportion of patients who suffered surgical complications (18, 20, 21, 25). Severe clinical heterogeneity was exhibited between the studies, which was explained in part by frailty. The estimated proportion to exhibit complications from the frail subgroup of patients was 24%, (95% CI 20% to 31%; $I^2=92\%$, [Figure 4Supplementary Table 1](#)) pre-frail subgroup 9% (95% CI 5% to 14%; $I^2=82\%$); and from the not-frail subgroup 5% (95% CI 3% to 7%; $I^2=70\%$). Post-operative complications were assessed using a variety of tools, including the Accordion Severity Classification(25), the American College of Surgeons National Surgical Improvement Program definitions(18, 20)and those constructed directly by the study authors(21)

Length of Stay

Four studies presented data on the length of stay and applied cut offs for participants as either frail, or non-frail (17, 18, 24, 25). The pooled mean length of stay in frail people was 9.6 days (95% CI 6.2 to 12.9) and in those who were non-frail was 6.4

days (4.9 to 7.9), see Supplementary Figure [24](#). However, substantial heterogeneity was found within both of the frailty subgroups that was not able to be explained.

Sensitivity analyses and pre-specified subgroups used to explain the heterogeneity

Due to the few numbers of included studies no sensitivity analyses were carried out. Apart from the subgroups stated explicitly stated above, none of the other pre-specified subgroup were able to explain the heterogeneity exhibited in the pooled meta-analyses.

Discussion

This study identified 9 studies, of which 8 were included in the analyses and were quality assessed. The studies covered a wide range of upper and lower abdominal surgical conditions, including both benign and malignant conditions, five of which were good quality and the remaining three fair quality.

We found evidence of an increase in the proportion of patients that suffered mortality and surgical complications in those that were frail, compared to those patients who were not frail. Analysis identified short term (up to 30 day) mortality to be more frequent in those people who were frail. Post-operative complications were more frequent and length of hospital stay longer in frail individuals following their surgical illness.

This review is the first review to characterize frailty in a general surgery patient group. Other recent reviews, whilst also demonstrating that frailty was associated with post-operative complications examined studies from a range of surgical specialties, not solely general surgery: for example Lin and colleagues (26) and the narrative review by Beggs *et al* (27). This review also differs as it considers eight studies for meta-analysis. Lin *et al* identified three general surgical articles for review but did not perform meta-analysis(26). Of the three studies which were considered by those authors, two (17, 19) are considered in this review and one (28) was excluded as the frailty assessment tool used was constructed by the study authors. However, our population did still contain some heterogeneity such as a range of age and both elective and emergency cases which may have confounded the overall association with 30 day

mortality and increased post operative complications that was demonstrated in this review.

Strengths and weaknesses

All of the studies included were of at least moderate quality, with more than half being judged as good quality. ~~Due to the non-randomised nature of the included studies a combination of selection bias, performance bias, confounding and reporting bias is possible so the findings of this review should be viewed with caution.~~ The specific biases associated with the studies were varied however, they include a poor description of the data collection methods and the non-frail comparator groups and in one(22) a very large male prevalence of the study participants. The degree to which these affect the overall finding is hard to determine but does need to be noted. Further, due to the non-randomised nature of the included studies the findings of this review should be viewed with caution Since the included study designs were cross-sectional, we took a conservative approach by comparing proportions, rather than estimating the increased relative risk of those with increased frailty.

However, a strength of the evidence linking frailty to poorer outcomes is consistency, with little heterogeneity demonstrated in most outcomes. The findings also suggest a dose-response of poorer outcomes linked to the presence of frailty when compared with the pre-frail subgroup, although we acknowledge that the pre-frail group was comprised of a comparatively small number of participants. The biological plausibility and a reasonable consistency across the varying studies is indicative that frailty is linked with poorer post-surgical outcomes.

There was heterogeneity found within the post-operative complications outcomes, but we believe that this was introduced by differing methods used to assess post-operative complications. For example two studies (18, 20) used the American College of Surgery National Surgical Quality Improvement Program definition, one (25) the American Society Guidelines and another(21) defined their own list of post-operative complications. Future studies should consider using a standardised post-operative complication definition, as this will aid accurate comparison between frail surgical patients across studies.

The quantity of robust published data for individual outcomes was limited. None of the preselected outcome measures were reported in more than four studies and two (medium term mortality and readmission to hospital) were only reported in two studies. Using small numbers of studies for meta-analysis requires a degree of caution when interpreting results, but throughout all of the outcomes there is a consistent and repeated effect of frailty.

A potential limitation was the absence of data from patients with special clinical situations such as intensive care admission. The decision was taken to exclude these data to avoid introducing confounding. However, it should be noted as a potential area for future dedicated systematic review in light of evidence that frailty predicts risk of institutionalisation in surgical patients who are admitted to intensive care (12).

The present review found a range of frailty assessment tools were chosen and implemented across the studies which will have introduced heterogeneity. This is to be expected as there are two broad models used for frailty assessment, the phenotype model and the accumulation of deficits model. Both models are valid and can be applied to research and clinical situations with the proviso that staff using these tools are trained in their use (29). The search criteria in this review stated that we would only include studies that employed recognized frailty assessment methods. Eight of the included studies used either phenotype or deficit accumulation models. The only caution and deviation from the inclusion criteria was the decision to include the study by Robinson *et al* (25). This study did not use an established frailty assessment tool which conformed to either of the models described above. However, the primary author and the associated team have published widely in the field of surgical disease in the older person and the assessment tool they use is robust, validated and is being used by additional research groups. Therefore, following consensus, it was decided to include this study.

It is also of note that one study (24) met our inclusion criteria but did not form part of the analysis. It was not possible to extract data from those contained in the manuscript. No response was received from the study authors for a more detailed breakdown of data which may have been usable. Should future studies wish to revisit this area, perhaps to address a different outcome, these data need to be included for

completeness. The findings of the study were all in keeping with the reported meta-analysis and frailty showed an association with morbidity ($p=0.02$).

Additionally we excluded large database type assessments of frailty(8) from our analysis. The primary rationale was ~~two~~^{three} fold. Firstly, these studies used frailty assessments derived specifically for each database according to the factors available within them and were not uniform in construction ~~and~~. Secondly, they were of such scale that to have included them would have influenced the results to such an extent that other smaller studies would have had virtually no effect on the outcome measures generated. ~~and thirdly none of them used assessments that are used in clinical practice, limiting their day to day utility.~~

Implications for research and clinical practice

All of the included studies were published since 2010, and it is likely that further studies will be suitable for combination with the data shown here to further reinforce (or repudiate) our findings. Perhaps more importantly, it is likely that additional outcome data will become available for measures such as long term mortality, and for patient-facing measures such as quality of life after surgery and requirement for social care provision. Further research in these areas will allow more comprehensive assessment of the impact that surgical conditions and their management have on frail patients.

By establishing the impact of frailty on both morbidity and mortality, this study further highlights the importance of this clinical condition. Clinicians can use the presence of frailty to help predict worse outcomes in general surgery. Where possible frailty should be identified pre-operatively, allowing the use of targeted interventions such as Comprehensive Geriatric Assessment (30, 31) with the aim of optimizing clinical condition prior to surgical management.

Conclusions

This study demonstrated that frailty is common in both elective and emergency general surgery. Despite a limited number of studies included in each of the meta-analyses frailty demonstrated a consistent association with both mortality and morbidity.

Funding statement: No funding was received for this study.

Contribution of authors:

JH conceived the study, searched the literature, extracted the data, drafted the manuscript

SL searched the literature, extracted the data, drafted the manuscript.

BC developed the methods, arbitrated differences in data extraction, carried out the analysis, interpreted the analysis, and drafted the manuscript

KM conceived the study, reviewed the manuscript

SPB conceived the study, reviewed the manuscript

AC conceived the study, advised on the methods for the study, and reviewed the manuscript

JH is the guarantor of this review.

Figure 2 – Mortality at Day 30




Figure 3 Mortality at Day 90 to 180





Figure 4 — The proportion of patients who suffer complications following surgery, by frailty



1. Clegg A, Young J, Iliffe S, Rikkert MO, Rockwood K. Frailty in elderly people. *Lancet*. 2013;381(9868):752-62.
2. Partridge JSL, Harari D, Dhessi JK. Frailty in the older surgical patient: a review. *Age and Ageing*. 2012;41(2):142-7.
3. Elderly: NCEiPOaDNEESit. An Age Old Problem. 2010.
4. Hogan DB, Maxwell CJ, Afilalo J, Arora RC, Bagshaw SM, Basran J, et al. A Scoping Review of Frailty and Acute Care in Middle-Aged and Older Individuals with Recommendations for Future Research. *Can Geriatr J*. 2017;20(1):22-37.
5. Wallis SJ, Wall J, Biram RW, Romero-Ortuno R. Association of the clinical frailty scale with hospital outcomes. *QJM*. 2015;108(12):943-9.
6. Jiang M, Foebel AD, Kuja-Halkola R, Karlsson I, Pedersen NL, Hagg S, et al. Frailty index as a predictor of all-cause and cause-specific mortality in a Swedish population-based cohort. *Aging (Albany NY)*. 2017;9(12):2629-46.
7. Buta BJ, Walston JD, Godino JG, Park M, Kalyani RR, Xue QL, et al. Frailty assessment instruments: Systematic characterization of the uses and contexts of highly-cited instruments. *Ageing Res Rev*. 2016;26:53-61.
8. Farhat JS, Velanovich V, Falvo AJ, Horst HM, Swartz A, Patton JH, et al. Are the frail destined to fail? Frailty index as predictor of surgical morbidity and mortality in the elderly. *Journal of Trauma and Acute Care Surgery*. 2012;72(6):1526-30.
9. Harrison JK, Reid J, Quinn TJ, Shenkin SD. Using quality assessment tools to critically appraise ageing research: a guide for clinicians. *Age Ageing*. 2017;46(3):359-65.
10. Stang A. Critical evaluation of the Newcastle-Ottawa scale for the assessment of the quality of nonrandomized studies in meta-analyses. *Eur J Epidemiol*. 2010;25(9):603-5.
11. Fried LP, Tangen CM, Walston J, Newman AB, Hirsch C, Gottdiener J. Frailty in older adults: evidence for a phenotype. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*. 2001;56.
12. Robinson TN, Wallace JL, Wu DS, Wiktor A, Pointer LF, Pfister SM, et al. Accumulated Frailty Characteristics Predict Postoperative Discharge Institutionalization in the Geriatric Patient. *Journal of the American College of Surgeons*. 2011;213(1):37-42.
13. Rockwood K, Howlett SE, MacKnight C, Beattie BL, Bergman H, Hebert R. Prevalence, attributes, and outcomes of fitness and frailty in community-dwelling older adults: report from the Canadian study of health and aging. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*. 2004;59.
14. Rockwood K, Song X, MacKnight C, Bergman H, Hogan DB, McDowell I. A global clinical measure of fitness and frailty in elderly people. *CMAJ*. 2005;173.
15. Slaets JP. Vulnerability in the elderly: frailty. *Med Clin North Am*. 2006;90(4):593-601.
16. Chen CC, Lin MT, Liang JT, Chen CM, Yen CJ, Huang GH. Pre-surgical Geriatric Syndromes, Frailty, and Risks for Postoperative Delirium in Older Patients Undergoing Gastrointestinal Surgery: Prevalence and Red Flags. *J Gastrointest Surg*. 2015;19(5):927-34.
17. Hewitt J, Moug SJ, Middleton M, Chakrabarti M, Stechman MJ, McCarthy K, et al. Prevalence of frailty and its association with mortality in general surgery. *American Journal of Surgery*. 2015;209(2):254-9.
18. Joseph B, Pandit V, Zangbar B, Kulvatunyou N, Tang AL, O'Keeffe T, et al. Emergency general surgery in the elderly: Too old or too frail? *Journal of the American College of Surgeons*. 2014;1:S53-S4.
19. Kenig J, Zychiewicz B, Olszewska U, Richter P. Screening for frailty among older patients with cancer that qualify for abdominal surgery. *Journal of Geriatric Oncology*. 2015;6(1):52-9.
20. Makary MA, Segev DL, Pronovost PJ, Syin D, Bandeen-Roche K, Patel P, et al. Frailty as a Predictor of Surgical Outcomes in Older Patients. *Journal of the American College of Surgeons*. 2010;210(6):901-8.
21. Reisinger KW, van Vugt JL, Tegels JJ, Snijders C, Hulsewe KW, Hoofwijk AG, et al. Functional compromise reflected by sarcopenia, frailty, and nutritional depletion predicts adverse postoperative outcome after colorectal cancer surgery. *Annals of Surgery*. 2015;261(2):345-52.
22. Robinson TN, Wu DS, Sauaia A, Dunn CL, Stevens-Lapsley JE, Moss M, et al. Slower Walking Speed Forecasts Increased Postoperative Morbidity and 1-Year Mortality across Surgical Specialties. *Annals of Surgery*. 2013;258(4):582-90.
23. Saxton A, Velanovich V. Preoperative Frailty and Quality of Life as Predictors of Postoperative Complications. *Annals of Surgery*. 2011;253(6):1223-9.

24. Tegels JJW, de Maat MFG, Hulsewe KWE, Hoofwijk AGM, Stoot J. Value of Geriatric Frailty and Nutritional Status Assessment in Predicting Postoperative Mortality in Gastric Cancer Surgery. *Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*. 2014;18(3):439-46.
25. Robinson TN, Wu DS, Pointer L, Dunn CL, Cleveland JC, Moss M. Simple frailty score predicts postoperative complications across surgical specialties. *American Journal of Surgery*. 2013;206(4):544-50.
26. Lin H-S, Watts JN, Peel NM, Hubbard RE. Frailty and post-operative outcomes in older surgical patients: a systematic review. *BMC Geriatrics*. 2016;16(1):157.
27. Beggs T, Sepehri A, Sz wajcer A, Tangri N, Arora RC. Frailty and perioperative outcomes: a narrative review. *Can J Anaesth*. 2015;62(2):143-57.
28. Kim SW, Han HS, Jung HW, Kim KI, Hwang DW, Kang SB, et al. Multidimensional frailty score for the prediction of postoperative mortality risk. *JAMA Surg*. 2014;149(7):633-40.
29. Morley JE, Vellas B, van Kan GA, Anker SD, Bauer JM, Bernabei R, et al. Frailty consensus: a call to action. *J Am Med Dir Assoc*. 2013;14(6):392-7.
30. Ellis G, Gardner M, Tsiachristas A, Langhorne P, Burke O, Harwood RH, et al. Comprehensive geriatric assessment for older adults admitted to hospital. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2017;9:CD006211.
31. Ellis G, Whitehead MA, Robinson D, O'Neill D, Langhorne P. Comprehensive geriatric assessment for older adults admitted to hospital: meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *BMJ*. 2011;343:d6553.